REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed July 14, 2003. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 2 – 7, 9 – 18 and 21 - 26 remain pending. In particular, Applicants have directly amended claims 4, 11, 15 and 21. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action indicates that claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 15 – 18 and 21 - 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over *Motegi* in view of *Pauschinger*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

With respect to claim 4, that claim has been amended to recite:

> 4. A printing system for use with a workstation having a first code entry device, the workstation being configured to transmit print data for printing, the first code entry device being configured to receive first coding information from a user, said printing system comprising:
>
> a printer configured to communicatively couple with the workstation and having a second code entry device, said second code entry device being configured to receive second coding information from the user, said printer being configured to print the print data in response to correlating the first coding information received at the first code entry device with said second coding information received at said second code entry device;
>
> a user interface configured to communicate with the workstation, said user interface having a secured-disable mode and a secure-enable mode such that, in said secure-enable mode, the workstation is enabled to receive the first coding information, ***and in the secure-disable mode, the workstation is enabled to transmit print data to the printer for printing and the printer prints the print data without receiving the first coding information at the first code entry device and without receiving the second coding information at the second code entry device.***
>
> (Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that the cited combination is legally deficient for the purpose of rendering obvious claim 4. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination does not teach or reasonably suggest at least the features/limitations emphasized

B

above in claim 4. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references, either individually or in combination do not teach or reasonably suggest "in the secure-disable mode, the workstation is enabled to transmit print data to the printer for printing and the printer prints the print data without receiving the first coding information at the first code entry device and without receiving the second coding information at the second code entry device."

In this regard, Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner's attention to *Motegi*, which indicates:

> The printer server 111 receives data for example, a user password, a job number and an image data, from the host computer 113, and receives a job number and password inputted by user from the operation panel.
>
> In this network, data for printing is sent from the computer 101 to the network server 105, which processes the data and sends the processed data to the host computer 113. The host computer 113 matches a job number with the password (assigned to the user or established by the host computer) and the image data to be printed, as supplied from the computer 101 by way of the network server 105. The user is then free to go to any printer on the network and have the document printed therefrom. ***To this end, the user walks to a printer (e.g., printer 107) and inputs the job number and password on the printers operation panel. Alternatively, the user need not be physically present, but send control commands to the selected printer 107, identifying the password and job number, as if the user had entered this information on the printers key pad.*** The selected printer 107 then requests the password and job number be verified by the host computer 113, by passing the password and job number provided by the user through the print server 111 to the host printer 113 (*Motegi*, column 3, lines 15 – 37).
> (Emphasis Added).

Additionally, *Motegi* also discloses:

> Furthermore, the user may have the document printed with a reasonably high degree of certainty that the confidentiality of the document will not be compromised ***because only users who know the password and job number are able to activate the printing of the document at the selected printer.*** (*Motegi*, column 4, lines 26 – 30). (Emphasis Added).

As indicated above in *Motegi*, a password and job number must be used to enable printing to be performed. Applicants respectfully assert, therefore, that *Motegi* cannot be

B

properly construed to teach or reasonably suggest that "the printer prints the print data without receiving the first coding information at the first code entry device and without receiving the second coding information at the second code entry device," as recited in claim 4. *Pauschinger* does not teach or reasonably suggest at leas this feature either.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 4 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 2, 3, 5 – 7, 22 and 23 depend from claim 4 and incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 4, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance.

Claim 11 recites:

> 11. A printing security system for use with a workstation and a printer, the workstation being configured to communicatively couple with the printer, the workstation being configured to transmit print data to the printer for printing, said printing security system comprising:
>
> a first code entry device configured to communicatively couple with the workstation, receive first coding information from the user, and provide the first coding information to the workstation; and
>
> a second code entry device configured to communicatively couple with the printer, receive second coding information from the user, and provide the second coding information to the printer such that the printer is enabled to print the print data in response to said first coding information received at said first code entry device corresponding to said second coding information received at said second code entry device;
>
> a user interface configured to communicate with the workstation, said user interface having a secure-disable mode and a secure-enable mode such that, said secure-enable mode, the workstation is enabled to receive said first coding information, ***and in the secure-disable mode, the workstation is enabled to transmit print data to the printer for printing and the printer prints the print data without receiving the first coding information at the first code entry device and without receiving the second coding information at the second code entry device.***
>
> (Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that the cited combination is legally deficient for the purpose of rendering obvious claim 11. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination does not teach or reasonably suggest at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 11. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references,

B

either individually or in combination, do not teach or reasonably suggest "in the secure-disable mode, the workstation is enabled to transmit print data to the printer for printing and the printer prints the print data without receiving the first coding information at the first code entry device and without receiving the second coding information at the second code entry device." Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 11 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 9, 10, 12 – 14, 24 and 25 depend from claim 11 and incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 11, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 recites:

> 15. A method for providing secure printing between a workstation and a printer, the workstation being configured to transmit print data to the printer for printing, said method comprising the steps of:
> when operating in a secure-enable mode:
> receiving first coding information, at the workstation, from a user;
> enabling print data and the first coding information to be transmitted to the printer;
> receiving second coding information, at the printer, from the user;
> comparing the first coding information with the second coding information such that if the first coding information corresponds to the second coding information, enabling printing of the print data at the printer, and if the first coding information does not correspond to the second coding information, not enabling printing of the print data at the printer; and
> ***when operating in a secure-disable mode:***
> enabling print data to be transmitted to the printer; and
> ***enabling printing of the print data at the printer without receiving the first coding information at the first code entry device and without receiving the second coding information at the second coding device.***
> (Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that the cited combination is legally deficient for the purpose of rendering obvious claim 15. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination does not teach or reasonably suggest at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 15. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references,

B

either individually or in combination, do not teach or reasonably suggest "when operating in a secure-disable mode: "enabling printing of the print data at the printer without receiving the first coding information at the first code entry device and without receiving the second coding information at the second coding device." Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 15 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 16 - 18 depend from claim 15 and incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 15, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance.

Claim 21 recites:

> 21. A computer readable medium having a computer program for providing secure printing between a workstation and a printer, the workstation being configured to transmit print data to the printer for printing, said computer readable medium comprising:
> logic configured to receive first coding information, at the workstation, from a user;
> logic configured to receive second coding information, provided at the printer, from the user;
> logic configured to compare the first coding information with the second coding information; and
> logic configured to enable printing of the print data at the printer if the first coding information corresponds to the second coding information wherein the logic configured to receive first coding information comprises:
> a first code segment configured to provide a user interface at the workstation, the user interface having a secure-disable mode and a secure-enable mode such that, in the secure-enable mode, the workstation is enabled to receive the first coding information, and ***in the secure-disable mode, the workstation is enabled to transmit print data to the printer for printing and the printer prints the print data without receiving the first coding information at the first code entry device and without receiving the second coding information at the second code entry device.***
> (Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully assert that the cited combination is legally deficient for the purpose of rendering obvious claim 21. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination, does not teach or reasonably suggest at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 21. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references, either individually or in combination do not teach or reasonably suggest "in the secure-disable

B

mode, the workstation is enabled to transmit print data to the printer for printing and the printer prints the print data without receiving the first coding information at the first code entry device and without receiving the second coding information at the second code entry device." Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 21 is in condition for allowance. Since claim 26 depends from claim 21 and incorporates all the features/limitations of claim 21, Applicants respectfully assert that this claim also is in condition for allowance.

Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

B

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 2 – 7, 9 – 18 and 21 - 26 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

M. Paul Qualey, Jr., Reg. No. 43, 024

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
100 Galleria Parkway N.W., Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313,
on 10/03/03.

Stephanie Riley
Signature

B